

## **REMARKS**

Claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-33, 35-39, 41-45, 47, and 48 are pending in the present application and stand rejected in the office action dated October 16, 2009 (hereinafter "current office action"). In the current response, claim 32 has been cancelled and independent claims 31, and 37 and dependent claims 35 and 38 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

### **Examiner Interview**

The Applicants' undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Pannala for taking the time to conduct an interview on December 8, 2009. During the interview, the objection to the Section 103 rejection was discussed as well as the Examiner's Amendment in the previous notice of allowance. Regarding Section 103, the undersigned discussed differences in the cited art and Applicants' invention. No agreement was reached, but the Examiner requested that Applicants make note of arguments and amendment in the present response.

Regarding issues with the Examiner's Amendment that accompanied the withdrawn Notice of Allowance, Examiner noted the inaccuracies of the Office Action. Also, in a follow-up call on December 16, 2009 to the Examiner regarding non-addressed claims 6-10, 16-20, and 26-30, Examiner advised that the objections should be noted in the office action response.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-32, 34-38, 40-44, and 45-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,735,598 (hereinafter Srivastava) and in view of U.S. Patent 7,159,007 (hereinafter Stawikowski).

### ***Request for Consideration of Claims***

As discussed during the interview, Applicants would like to point out that the current office action does not reflect the proper status of the claims and, further, a number of claims or elements within certain claims were not addressed or considered in the current office

action. For example, claims 6-10, 16-20, and 26-30 were not considered in whole or in-part in the current office action rejection. Further, the office action neglects to address the claims as they were amended in an Examiner's Amendment that was previously entered with the August 7, 2009 notice of allowance (which was later withdrawn) and previous office actions that canceled claims 34, 40, and 46.

As a result, the Applicants cannot reasonably respond to the claim rejections, in particular the rejections of claims 6-10, 16-20, and 26-30, and hereby requests that the rejection of at least claims 6-10, 16-20, and 26-30 be withdrawn. As described above, these errors were discussed with the Examiner. If the Examiner does find some reasonable grounds for rejection, Applicants request a second Non-final Office Action where the limitations of all the rejected claims are addressed.

***Claims 31, 32, 35-37, 38, 40-43, 44, 46-48***

The claims are directed to executing .NET managed code in a database management system that affords the acknowledgment of the invocation context and how it is exposed and made available to end users, the separation of immutable and mutable parts of a request, the utilization of an in-process provider in exposing a client's connection; and other attributes which, among other things, allow for easier use and higher efficiencies.

The office action asserts that Srivastava teaches the exposing of a client's connection context through the utilization of an in process provider and that Stawikowski teaches invoking an invocation context in the database server. However, Applicants traverse each of these rejection and respectfully request reconsideration thereof based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Inproc Provider**

Claim 31, as amended, claim 37, and claim 43 recite exposing the client's connection context to the database server through the utilization of an in-process provider.

The office action asserts that Srivastava's dynamic linking of a database server to a subclass at the time the code is executed as teaching the utilization of an in process provider. However, Srivastava only makes a cursory statement regarding dynamic linking during the execution of code. Srivastava's dynamic link to a subclass does not teach or suggest

exposing the client's connection context to the database server. In particular, a dynamic link to a subclass is not maintained within the managed memory of the .NET process as achieved by an in-process provider and nowhere does Srivastava teach that the client's connection context is exposed via the dynamic link. In other words, Srivastava's dynamic link to a subclass does not infer that the client's connection context is exposed.

The claimed in-process provider, on the other hand, exposes the client's connection context from managed code running in the server. As described in the specification, exposing the client's connection context through in-process provider provides such benefits as efficient data marshaling. *Specification Paragraph [0059-60]*. Thus, Srivastava's dynamic link to a subclass does not describe exposing the client's connection context to the database server through the utilization of an in-process provider.

However, without prejudice or disclaimer regarding the assertions of the office action, Applicants have amended the claim to clarify "wherein the in-process provider keeps track of unmanaged data that is referenced from a managed space and prevents access of the unmanaged data outside a managed execution frame." Nowhere does Srivastava teach an in-process provider much less an in-process provider exposing a client's connection context to a database server, and/or an in-process provider that ***keeps track of unmanaged data that is referenced from a managed space and prevents access of the unmanaged data outside a managed execution frame.***

Therefore, Applicants submit that Srivastava does not teach exposing the client's connection context to the database server through the utilization of an in-process provider. Accordingly, because the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 31 and 37.

#### Invocation Context

Claims 31, as amended, claim 37, and claims 43 recite "invoking an invocation context in the database server, wherein the invocation context provides access to a client's connection context."

The office action asserts that Stawikowski's execution of a remote program on an IP network teaches invoking an invocation context in the database server, wherein the invocation context provides access to a client's connection context. However, nowhere does

Stawikowski teach or suggest the claim element. Simply executing a program or set of programs on an IP network does not result in the invoking of an invocation context much less an invocation context that provides access to the client's connection context. In contrast to anything described in Stawikowski, the recited "invoking the invocation context in the database server and providing access to the client's connection context" accounts for problems such as certain data access operations only being valid if run under the caller's context (e.g., access to inserted and deleted pseudo-tables or lock sharing). Stawikowski's mere description of executing a program or set of programs on an IP network (*Specification Paragraph [0047]*) does not teach the recited invocation context or invoking of such invocation context and is unrelated to the claimed concept.

Without prejudice or disclaimer, claim 31 and 37 have been amended to recite invoking an invocation context in the database server, wherein the invocation context comprises providing access to a client's connection context, a client's command context, a client's transaction context, a client's pipe context, and client's trigger context. Stawikowski does not teach invoking an invocation context and, as such, does not teach that the invocation context provides access to a client's connection context, a client's command context, a client's transaction context, a client's pipe context, and client's trigger context.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Stawikowski does not teach "invoking an invocation context in the database server, wherein the invocation context provides access to a client's connection context." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 31 and 37.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that Srivastava fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 31 and Stawikowski fails to supply the missing features. Where applicable, the foregoing remarks apply equally as well to independent claims 37 and 43. Thus, no combination of Srivastava and Stawikowski will produce the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of independent claims 31, 37 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn. Inasmuch as dependent claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-30, 32-33, 35-36, 38-39, 41-42, 44-45, 47, and 48 depend from one of the independent claims 31, 37 and 43, they too are believed to be allowable for at least the same applicable foregoing reasons.

***Dependent Claims 33, 39, 45 – ADO.net***

Claims 33, 39, and 45 recite that the client from independent claims 31, 37, and 43 is a .NET application and the in-process provider is an ADO.net in-process provider.

The office action asserts that dependent claims 33, 39, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava in view of Stawikowsk and in view of Woodring (U.S. Patent 7,020,660), where Woodring is cited as teaching ADO.net. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 33, 39, and 45 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable independent claims 31, 37, and 43, respectively. However, without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicants respectfully submit that Woodring does not teach ADO.net as submitted by the office action.

Applicants concede that Woodring teaches **ADO**. However, Woodring does not teach **ADO.net**, a distinct difference from ADO. For example, as distinguished in Applicants' Specification, "ActiveX Data Object (ADO) is an application program interface from Microsoft that lets a programmer writing Windows applications get access to a relational or non-relational database from both Microsoft and other database providers." (*Specification-Paragraph [0007]*). In contradistinction to Woodring and ADO, "ADO.net is a set of classes in .NET that allows for data access. ADO.net is comprised of classes found in the System.Data namespace that encapsulate data access for distributed applications. However, rather than simply mapping the existing ADO object model to .NET to provide a managed interface to OLEDB and SQL Server, ADO.net changes the way data is stored and marshaled within and between applications." (*Specification-Paragraph [0009]*).

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of dependent claims 33, 39 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn because although Woodring teaches ADO it does not teach or suggest ADO.net which is separate and distinct from ADO.

**CONCLUSION**

By the remarks and the amendments provided herein, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action mailed October 16, 2009 has been traversed and that the application is in condition for allowance. Any amendments made during prosecution are

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-3026/307009.01  
**Application No.:** 10/776,370  
**Office Action Dated:** October 16, 2009

**PATENT**

without abandonment of subject matter. Applicants expressly reserve the right to, in the pending application or any application related thereto, reintroduce any subject matter removed from the scope of claims by any amendment and introduce any subject matter not present in current or previous claims. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-33, 35-39, 41-45, 47, and 48. If the Examiner has any concerns regarding the response provided herein, or wishes to discuss the response further, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Date: January 19, 2010

/Craig L. Cupid/  
Craig L. Cupid  
Registration No. 61,308

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439